Preprint typeset in JHEP style - HYPER VERSION

Revised cosmological parameters after BICEP 2 and BOSS

Santanu Das, Suvodip Mukherjee & Tarun Souradeep

Inter-University Centre for Astronomy and Astrophysics, Post Bag 4, Ganeshkhind, Pune 411007, India

E-mail: santanud@iucaa.ernet.in, suvodip@iucaa.ernet.in, tarun@iucaa.ernet.in

arXiv:1406.0857v2 [astro-ph.CO] 12 Feb 2015

Abstract: Estimation of parameters of the 'standard' model of cosmology have dramatically improved over past few decades due to increasingly exquisite measurements made by Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB) experiments. Recent data from Planck matches well with the minimal ΛCDM model. A likelihood analysis using Planck, WMAP and a selection of high resolution experiments (highL), tensor to scalar ratio $r_{0.002}$ is found to be < 0.11 when $dn_s/d\ln k = 0$. Planck also imposes an upper bound on neutrino mass $\sum m_\nu < 0.23\,\mathrm{eV}$ using Planck+WMAP+highL+BAO likelihood. However, recently results from BICEP 2 claims the detection of $r = 0.2^{+0.07}_{-0.05}$ from polarization spectra. Further, results from SDSS-III BOSS large scale galaxy survey constrains the total neutrino mass to $\sum m_\nu = 0.36 \pm 0.10$ eV. It is important to study the consequences of these new measurements on other cosmological parameters. In this paper we assess the revised constraints on cosmological parameters in light of these two measurements that are in some tension with the constraints from Planck.

The sensitivity of Planck to weak lensing effect on the CMB angular power spectrum suggests that the normalized amplitude of physical lensing power $A_L > 1$ at 2σ hints at a potentially important internal inconsistency. Therefore, we also include a study of the constraints on A_L. Using the prior on $\sum m_\nu$ as measured by SDSS-III BOSS and BICEP 2 likelihood, we find that the model with running spectral index ($dn_s/d\ln k \neq 0$) leads to a value of $A_L > 1$ at 3.1σ. But, the model with $dn_s/d\ln k = 0$ makes A_L consistent with 1, at 2.1σ and also shows that $N_{\rm eff}$ is consistent with its theoretical value of 3.046 at around 2σ. Therefore, the analysis in this paper shows that the model with $dn_s/d\ln k = 0$ gives consistency with other cosmological parameters ($N_{\rm eff}$ and A_L) when the current limits on $\sum m_\nu$ and $r_{0.05}$ are considered. However, on reducing the value of $r_{0.05}$, the model with non-zero $dn_s/d\ln k$ gives consistent result of $A_L = 1$.

Contents

1. Cosmological Parameter Estimation **2**

1.1 Beyond Standard 6 parameters with $\sum m_\nu$ and $r_{0.05}$ 4

1.2 Standard 6 parameters + $dn_s/d\ln k$ with $\sum m_\nu$ and $r_{0.05}$ 5

1.3 Standard 6 parameters + $N_{\rm eff}$ with $\sum m_\nu$ and $r_{0.05}$ 6

1.4 Standard 6 parameters + A_L + $dn_s/d\ln k$ with $\sum m_\nu$ and $r_{0.05}$ 8

2. Discussions and Conclusions **10**

Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB) is a very powerful probe for improving our understanding of the Universe. Several CMB missions like COBE, WMAP, Planck, ACT, SPT, BICEP etc., have ushered an era of precision cosmology. High resolution CMB ESA space mission Planck [1] have measured CMB power spectra match extraordinarily well with the minimal ΛCDM model (in particular at angular scales smaller than few degrees corresponding to multipole $l > 50$). Planck has also pinpointed the allowed range of several cosmological parameters from the temperature spectra alone [2]. Further improvement on these constraints are expected in the final release that would include CMB polarization data. However, recent results from BICEP 2 [3] claimed the detection of C_l^{BB} spectra arising due to the primordial Gravitational Wave (GW) with tensor to scalar ratio $(r) = 0.2^{+0.07}_{-0.05}$, which is in mild tension with Planck [2], which estimates $r < 0.11$ without running spectral index $(dn_s/d\ln k = 0)$. However, this tension reduces while considered running spectral index $(dn_s/d\ln k \neq 0)$ in the temperature power spectra [2]. Also the constraint on neutrino mass $(\sum m_\nu = 0.36 \pm 0.10$ eV) using Baryon Oscillation Spectroscopic Survey (BOSS) CMASS data release 11 by Beutler et al.[4] is in mild tension with the measurement of Planck $(\sum m_\nu < 0.23$ eV). On considering together the measurement of $r_{0.05}$ and $\sum m_\nu$ can significantly change the current limits on best-fit ΛCDM parameters obtained by Planck [2].

Since the release of two prime experiments BICEP 2 and BOSS, several authors, like [5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13] have placed constraints on different cosmological parameters using the available data. In this paper, we study the effects of high value of $r_{0.05}$ claim by BICEP 2 [3] and high non-zero $\sum m_\nu$ claim from BOSS-CMAS [4] on other cosmological parameters, using SCoPE [14]. Since, tensor contribution to temperature power spectra is at low multipoles $l < 100$, the detection of large tensor contribution to C_l^{TT} is revealed by the amplitude difference between the CMB



Figure 1: Temperature power spectra, $l(l+1)C_l^{TT}/2\pi$ for different sets of $r, \sum m_\nu, N_{eff}$ and $dn_s/d\ln k$ values obtained using CAMB [15]. Other parameters are kept fixed at their best-fit ΛCDM values [2].

power at the Sachs-Wolfe plateau and that at the acoustic peaks. Therefore, change in $r_{0.05}$ leads to a significant variation of several cosmological parameters which are constrained by the plateau and acoustic peaks. On the other hand significant neutrino mass changes the relativistic matter content of the universe at early times and hence it affects the parameters like, H_0, $\Omega_b h^2$, $\Omega_c h^2$, $N_{\rm eff}$, A_L, that depend on the matter content of the universe and perturbations in them.

We make an extensive study of the effects on various parameters and search for a model that remains valid in our current theoretical regime. This improved constraint on the cosmological parameters are important for a better understanding of our cosmological models in light of the BICEP 2 and BOSS.

The paper is organized as follows, in Sec. 1 we present the estimation of cosmological parameters from WMAP-9, Planck and BICEP 2 data using the likelihood provided by them. Discussions and conclusions of the paper are provided in Sec. 2.

1. Cosmological Parameter Estimation

We calculate the constraints on different cosmological parameters using WMAP-9, Planck and BICEP 2 likelihood. However, before going to the main analysis, it is important to understand the effect of different parameters like $r, \sum m_\nu, N_{eff}$ and

$dn_s/d\ln k$ on CMB angular power spectrum. Fig. 1 shows the effects of different parameters on C_l^{TT}. Fig. 1(a) shows the effect of $r_{0.05}$ on C_l^{TT} for a range of values. All the other cosmological parameters are kept fixed at their standard values and we use $n_t = 0$. As the tensor power spectrum is dominant only at low multipoles, only lower multipoles get affected due to this variation. Plots show that $r_{0.05}$ is expected to be correlated with n_s, as that also affects the low multipole power. Fig. 1(b) and Fig. 1(c) show the effect of neutrinos on C_l^{TT}. Change in either of $N_{\rm eff}$ or $\sum m_\nu$, affects the total matter fraction in the universe, which leads to change in the expansion history of the universe and shifts the CMB peaks towards larger or smaller scales. These also affect the epoch of matter radiation equality and hence the ratio between the even and the odd peaks in the CMB power spectrum changes. In Fig. 1(b) we show the effects of variation of $\sum m_\nu$ keeping $N_{\rm eff}$ fixed at 3.048, whereas in Fig. 1(c) we choose the neutrinos to be massless. Finally, in Fig. 1(d) we show the effects of running spectral index $dn_s/d\ln k$ on C_l^{TT}.

We present most of the results using the following likelihoods :- 1) For Planck+WP + BICEP 2 likelihood, where we add up the results from commander_v4.1_lm49.clik, lowlike_v222.clik, CAMspec_v6.2TN_2013_02_26.clik likelihood [16, 17] and BICEP 2 likelihood [18] to perform parameter estimation. 2) For Planck+WP+ BICEP 2 + Lensing likelihood, where we add the lensing likelihood along with the other likelihoods.

We vary the Standard Six Parameters (SP), $\{\Omega_b h^2,\ \Omega_m h^2,\ h,\ \tau, n_s,\ A_s\}$, along with the other parameters like $dn_s/d\ln k$, n_t, $N_{\rm eff}$, A_L. The ranges of priors used for all these parameters are provided in Table. 1. We estimate parameters for the cosmological models, (a) SP, (b) SP + either of $\{dn_s/d\ln k,\ n_t,\ N_{eff}\}$ and (c) SP + $\{A_L + dn_s/d\ln k\}$ for all different sets of $\sum m_\nu$ and $r_{0.05}$ mentioned below.

1. $\sum m_\nu = 0$ and $r = 0$, (WP + Planck likelihood and WP + Planck + Lensing likelihood).

2. $\sum m_\nu \neq 0$ and $r = 0$, (WP + Planck likelihood and WP + Planck + Lensing likelihood).

3. $\sum m_\nu = 0$ and $r_{0.05} \neq 0$, (WP + Planck +BICEP 2 likelihood and WP + Planck + Lensing +BICEP 2 likelihood).

4. $\sum m_\nu \neq 0$ and $r_{0.05} \neq 0$, (WP + Planck + BICEP 2 likelihood and WP + Planck + Lensing + BICEP 2 likelihood).

Table 1: Prior range for the Cosmological parameters used in this paper.

Parameters	Prior range	Defination
$\Omega_b h^2$	0.015 – 0.03	Physical baryon density.
$\Omega_m h^2$	0.05 – 0.25	Physical matter density.
h	0.55 – 1.2	Hubble parameter.
τ	0.01 – 0.2	Reionization optical depth.
n_s	0.8 – 1.2	Scalar spectral index.
$\ln(10^{10} A_s) - 2\tau$	2.5 – 3.2	Amplitude of temperature fluctuations.
$r_{0.05}$	0 – 1	Ratio of tensor primordial power to curvature power at $k_0 = 0.05\,\mathrm{Mpc}^{-1}$.
$dn_s/d\ln k$	-2.0 – 2.0	Running of the scalar spectral index.
n_t	-0.25 – 0.25	Tensor spectral index.
N_{eff}	1.0 – 5.0	Effective number of nutrino-like relativistic degrees of freedom.
$\sum m_\nu$	pdf from BOSS [4]	The sum of neutrino masses .
A_L	0.5 – 3.5	Amplitude of the lensing power relative to the physical value.

1.1 Beyond Standard 6 parameters with $\sum m_\nu$ and $r_{0.05}$

First we discuss the statistics of standard 6 parameters $\{\Omega_b h^2,\ \Omega_c h^2,\ h,\ \tau,\ n_s,\ A_s\}$ due to the change in $r_{0.05}$ and $\sum m_\nu$. From the plots shown in Fig. 1, it is evident that if we change the value of $r_{0.05}$ or $\sum m_\nu$ then there can be significant effects on the cosmological parameters. We run SCoPE [14] with standard 6 cosmological parameters for all the cases mentioned in Sec. 1, and the results are shown in Fig. 2, Fig. 3 and Fig. 4. The two dimensional contour plots of $r_{0.05}$ and $\sum m_\nu$ with the standard model parameters with WP + Planck + BICEP 2 likelihood and WP + Planck + lensing + BICEP 2 likelihood are shown in blue and red color respectively in Fig. 2. It can be seen that $\sum m_\nu$ is strongly correlated with h with the correlation coefficient ~ -0.74. As $\sum m_\nu$ increases the value of h decreases, which is expected as the matter content of the universe is getting changed and leads to change in the epoch of matter-radiation equality of the universe. $\sum m_\nu$ also has small effect on the baryon density and the dark matter content of the universe. The effect of $r_{0.05}$ on h shows slight positive correlation as shown in Fig. 2. We can also notice that on using only WP + Planck + BICEP 2 likelihood, the average value of $\sum m_\nu$ is 0.33 eV whereas if lensing is included the average value increases and becomes 0.36 eV. Though, as variance is high, both the values are within 1σ of each other. The value of $r_{0.05}$ is same in both the cases and is approximately 0.16.

Fig. 3 and Fig. 4 show the one dimensional probability distribution for the standard cosmological parameters from WP + Planck+ BICEP 2 likelihood and



(a)



(b)

Figure 2: The two dimensional likelihood contours for the SP with $r_{0.002}$ and $\sum m_\nu$. (a): WP + Planck +BICEP 2 likelihood. (b): WP + Planck + lensing +BICEP 2 likelihood. The one dimensional marginal probability distribution for $r_{0.05}$ and $\sum m_\nu$ are shown in the last column. Gray dotted lines show the posterior on $r_{0.05}$ and $\sum m_\nu$ as obtained by BOSS and BICEP 2 respectively.

WP + Planck+ lensing + BICEP 2 likelihood respectively. Including both m_ν and $r_{0.05}$ in the estimation leads to lower value of Hubble constant ($h = 0.645$) as shown in Fig. 3 and Fig. 4, which is in tension with the results obtained from calibrated SNe magnitude-redshift relation by Riess et al. [19]. This tension increases further on taking into account of the lensing likelihood as shown in Fig. 4.

1.2 Standard 6 parameters + $dn_s/d\ln k$ with $\sum m_\nu$ and $r_{0.05}$

Simplest inflationary models predict that the running of the spectral index $dn_s/d\ln k$ is related to the higher order of inflationary slow roll parameters [20]. Tight observational constraints on $dn_s/d\ln k$, can rule out several inflationary models. Planck [2] has put constraint on $dn_s/d\ln k$ with $r < 0.26$ as, $dn_s/d\ln k = -0.022 \pm 0.010$, (68%; Planck + WP + highL)



Figure 3: One dimensional marginal probability distribution of the standard model parameters for four different cases without considering lensing likelihood. Red : Only the standard model parameters (SP) are varied. The neutrinos are considered to be massless. Blue : We vary $\sum m_\nu$ along with other SP. The number of massive neutrino species here are considered to be $N_{\rm eff} = 3.046$. For both these models we considered only the scalar power spectrum. Green : Analysis with $r_{0.05}$ and SP. Neutrinos are considered to be massless and $n_t = 0$. Black : We vary both $\sum m_\nu$ and $r_{0.05}$. The average and the standard deviations for the parameters are given in the plot itself. The best fit values are quoted in the brackets.

We obtain the constraints on $dn_s/d\ln k$ and n_s in Fig. 5. On considering no tensor spectrum, i.e. $r = 0$, $dn_s/d\ln k$ is well consistent with zero, which also matches Planck results. However, the constraint on $dn_s/d\ln k$ with BICEP 2 likelihood [3] shows 3.23σ deviation from zero. The effect of $\sum m_\nu$ over $dn_s/d\ln k$ is negligible. The case with both $\sum m_\nu$ and $r_{0.05}$, shows that $dn_s/d\ln k$ is consistent with zero at 2.7σ. We summarize the results for n_s and $dn_s/d\ln k$ on considering the measurement from BICEP 2 and BOSS in Table 2.

Table 2: Constriants on n_s and $dn_s/d\ln k$ for different set of parameters.

	SP+$\frac{dn_s}{d\ln k}$	SP+$\frac{dn_s}{d\ln k}$+$\sum m_\nu$	SP+$\frac{dn_s}{d\ln k}$+$r_{0.05}$	SP+$\frac{dn_s}{d\ln k}$+$\sum m_\nu$+$r_{0.05}$
n_s	0.953±0.006	0.0952±0.006	0.958±0.006	0.9570±0.0063
$\frac{dn_s}{d\ln k}$	-0.0105±0.0069	-0.0083±0.0072	-0.0271± 0.0084	-0.0246±0.0091

1.3 Standard 6 parameters + $N_{\rm eff}$ with $\sum m_\nu$ and $r_{0.05}$

In the standard model of particle physics there are 3 types of neutrinos corresponding



Figure 4: One dimensional marginal probability distribution of the standard model parameters for four different cases after considering lensing likelihood. The results are shown for four different cases. Red : Only the standard model parameters (SP) are varied. The neutrinos are considered to be massless here. Blue : We vary $\sum m_\nu$ along with other SP. The number of massive neutrino species here are considered to be $N_{\rm eff} = 3.046$. For both these models we considered only the scalar power spectrum. Green : Analysis with $r_{0.05}$ and SP. Neutrinos are considered to be massless and $n_t = 0$. Black : We vary both $\sum m_\nu$ and $r_{0.05}$. The average and the standard deviations for the parameters are given in the plot itself. The best fit values are quoted in the brackets.

to the three families of leptons. However, there are corrections to the $N_{\rm eff}$ due to non instantaneous decoupling and QED effects. This theoretically leads to $N_{\rm eff} = 3.046$. However, any other non-interacting relativistic species also effect the CMB power spectra in the same manner as neutrinos. Signature of any such relativistic species can therefore be found by estimating $N_{\rm eff}$ from the CMB measurements. In Fig. 6 we plot the one dimensional likelihood of $N_{\rm eff}$ for four different cases, (a) $N_{\rm eff}$ with standard 6 parameter case with $\sum m_\nu = 0$ and $r = 0$. (b) $N_{\rm eff}$ with standard 6 parameter, $r_{0.05}$ and $\sum m_\nu = 0$. (c) $N_{\rm eff}$ with standard 6 parameter case with $\sum m_\nu \neq 0$ and $r = 0$. (d) Non-zero value for both $\sum m_\nu$ and $r_{0.05}$. All these cases are studied by considering both lensing and without lensing.

As shown in the Fig. 6, if the massive neutrinos are considered then the $N_{\rm eff}$ decreases, whereas if tensor modes are considered with the massless neutrinos then the $N_{\rm eff}$ of the neutrinos increases. The values of $N_{\rm eff}$ for different cases are shown below,



Figure 5: Variation of $dn_s/d\ln k$ and n_s are shown for following cases. Blue : For SP+$dn_s/d\ln k$, Red : For SP+$dn_s/d\ln k$+$\sum m_\nu$, Gray : for SP+$dn_s/d\ln k$+$r_{0.05}$. Introducing tensor part leads to $dn_s/d\ln k$ away from the 0 at $\sim 3.23\sigma$.

$$N_{\rm eff} = \begin{cases} 3.3221 \pm 0.35 & SP + N_{\rm eff} + \sum m_\nu \,(\text{Planck} + \text{WP}) \\ 3.2938 \pm 0.32 & SP + N_{\rm eff} + \sum m_\nu \,(\text{Planck} + \text{WP} + \text{lensing}) \\ 3.4867 \pm 0.31 & SP + N_{\rm eff} \,(\text{Planck} + \text{WP}) \\ 3.4447 \pm 0.34 & SP + N_{\rm eff} \,(\text{Planck} + \text{WP} + \text{lensing}) \\ 3.9837 \pm 0.36 & SP + N_{\rm eff} + r_{0.05} \,(\text{Planck} + \text{WP} + \text{BICEP 2}) \\ 3.8867 \pm 0.34 & SP + N_{\rm eff} + r_{0.05} \,(\text{Planck} + \text{WP} + \text{lensing} + \text{BICEP 2}) \\ 3.7530 \pm 0.26 & SP + N_{\rm eff} + r_{0.05} + \sum m_\nu \,(\text{Planck} + \text{WP} + \text{BICEP 2}) \\ 3.6832 \pm 0.30 & SP + N_{\rm eff} + r_{0.05} + \sum m_\nu \,(\text{Planck} + \text{WP} + \text{lensing} + \text{BICEP 2}) \end{cases}$$

In Fig. 7, we plot the two dimensional likelihood of $N_{\rm eff}$ with all the other parameters for massless neutrino case, which shows that $N_{\rm eff}$ is positively correlated with almost all other parameters. Fig. 8 shows the two dimensional likelihood with $\sum m_\nu \neq 0$ and $r = 0$.

1.4 Standard 6 parameters + A_L + $dn_s/d\ln k$ with $\sum m_\nu$ and $r_{0.05}$

In this section we show the constraints on the A_L, i.e. the lensing power amplitude relative to the physical value [2]. Theoretically, A_L should be consistent with 1. However, Planck found that A_L is inconsistent with its theoretical value at 2σ level. Here we consider the effect on A_L due to the recent measurements of $\sum m_\nu$ and $r_{0.05}$. We vary A_L, $dn_s/d\ln k$, $\sum m_\nu$ and $r_{0.05}$ along with the other standard model parameters. The results are shown in Fig. 9 and Fig. 10.


Std. 6 par + N_eff (WP+Planck)
Std. 6 par + N_eff (WP+Planck+Lens)
Std. 6 par + N_eff + r_0.05(WP+Planck+BICEP2)
Std. 6 par + N_eff + r_0.05(WP+Planck+Lens+BICEP2)
Std. 6 par + N_eff + m_ν(WP+Planck)
Std. 6 par + N_eff + m_ν(WP+Planck+Lens)
Std. 6 par + N_eff + r_0.05 + m_ν(WP+Planck+BICEP2)
Std. 6 par + N_eff + r_0.05 + m_ν(WP+Planck+Lens+BICEP2)

Figure 6: Distribution of $N_{\rm eff}$ for different sets of parameters.



Figure 7: Two dimensional likelihood contours of $N_{\rm eff}$ for Planck+WP+BICEP 2 likelihood with standard model parameters and $r_{0.05}$. Neutrinos are considered to be massless for this case.

In Fig. 9 we show the scattered plot between A_L and $dn_s/d\ln k$ and color coded with $\sum m_\nu$, which shows for $A_L \approx 1$ is consistent for the $r_{0.05} = 0.2$ with lower value of $\sum m_\nu$ and without running. It shows A_L is negatively correlated with $dn_s/d\ln k$ and positively correlated with $r_{0.05}$. There is a mild positive correlation with correlation coefficient 0.06 between $\sum m_\nu$ and A_L. The one dimensional marginal probability distribution for different cases are shown in Fig. 10. It can be seen that if $dn_s/d\ln k = 0$ and $\sum m_\nu = 0$ then A_L is consistent with the physical value $A_L = 1$ at $\sim 2\sigma$ with the BICEP 2 likelihood[3]. However, if we vary $dn_s/d\ln k$ and $\sum m_\nu$ then the average value of A_L shifts towards higher value. For the case with $SP + r_{0.05} + \sum m_\nu +$



Figure 8: Two dimensional likelihood contours of $N_{\rm eff}$ for Planck+WP likelihood with standard model parameters and $\sum m_\nu$. We have considered $r = 0$ for this case.



(a) (b)

Figure 9: We plot A_L vs $dn_s/d\ln k$ in the scattered diagram and colour coded it with (a) $r_{0.05}$ and (b) $\sum m_\nu$. A_L is positively correlated with both $r_{0.05}$ and $\sum m_\nu$ and is negatively correlated with $dn_s/d\ln k$.

$dn_s/dk + A_L$ is inconsistent with 1 at 3.1σ. This shows that varying $dn_s/d\ln k$ with the prior on $\sum m_\nu$ and $r_{0.05}$ leads to an inconsistent lensing amplitude, whereas model without $dn_s/d\ln k$ is inconsistent at 2.1σ. So, the model without running with the given $\sum m_\nu$ and $r_{0.05}$ is slightly preferred. With the decrease in $r_{0.05}$ from the value measured by BICEP 2, A_L also decreases (as shown in Fig. 9). This will lead to a more consistent model with running spectral index and $\sum m_\nu = 0.36$.

2. Discussions and Conclusions

We study the effects of the new measurements of $r_{0.05}$ and $\sum m_\nu$ claimed by BICEP 2 and BOSS respectively, impose on other cosmological parameters. We evaluate the models $dn_s/d\ln k$ and $N_{\rm eff}$ along with the other SP $\{\Omega_b h^2, \Omega_m h^2, h, \tau, n_s, A_s\}$ for



Figure 10: The brown curve is for a case where we vary $r_{0.05}$, $\sum m_\nu$, A_L and $dn_s/d\ln k$ along with the other standard model parameters. We use WP+ Planck+ BICEP 2 likelihood, with prior on $\sum m_\nu$ from BOSS experiments. In the green curve we fix the value of $dn_s/d\ln k = 0$ and in the gray curve we fix both $dn_s/d\ln k = 0$ and $\sum m_\nu = 0$. The mean value and the standard deviations of A_L are shown inside the bracket in the legend.

four different cases as mentioned in Sec. 1. Our results show that $dn_s/d\ln k \neq 0$ at 2.7σ (Sec. 1.2) and $N_{\rm eff}$ is consistent with the theoretical value of 3.046 within 1.74σ (Sec. 1.3). This implies that the simplest inflationary model and with the known relativistic species in the universe, explains the observed temperature anisotropy spectra of CMB.

However, lensing amplitude A_L which plays an important role in estimating the value of both $N_{\rm eff}$ and $dn_s/d\ln k$ does not gives a consistent estimation when considered running spectral index along with the current bound on $r_{0.05}$ and $\sum m_\nu$. The model with $\sum m_\nu$, $r_{0.05}$ and $dn_s/d\ln k = 0$ makes A_L is consistent with 1, at 2.1σ. But if we allow $dn_s/d\ln k$ to vary, then we get $A_L > 1$ at 3.1σ level. Therefore, the models with running spectral index and the value of $r_{0.05}$ and $\sum m_\nu$ as measured by BICEP 2 and BOSS leads to an inconsistent cosmological model,

Hence, we can conclude that the standard cosmological model with $SP + \sum m_\nu + r$, $N_{\rm eff} = 3.046$ and $A_L = 1$, without running of the spectral index, $dn_s/d\ln k = 0$ is fully consistent with the data. Though, it implies $H_0 = 64.5 \pm 1.4$ kms^{-1} Mpc^{-1}, that disagrees with supernova measurements ($H_0 = 73.8 \pm 2.4$ kms^{-1} Mpc^{-1}) from HST [19] by 6.6σ. Improvement of measurements of H_0 and $\sum m_\nu$ from different future experiments can resolve this discrepancy. However, if Planck measures $r_{0.05} < 0.2$, then the inconsistency arising due to lensing amplitude $A_L > 1$ at more than 3σ goes away (as shown in Fig. 9) and the model with $\sum m_\nu$ and $dn_s/d\ln k$ becomes consistent. In Table 3, we summarize all these findings to give a comprehensive

understanding of this analysis. The constraints on $r_{0.05}$ can be improved with the full sky measurement of polarization data from Planck, which is expected to be released in near future. All these together can lead to more precise measurement of the cosmological models.

Table 3: Summary for our analysis with WP+Planck+BICEP 2 likelihood for models beyond standard 6 parameters ($\{\Omega_b h^2,\ \Omega_m h^2,\ h,\ \tau, n_s,\ A_s\}$) are mentioned below.

Model	Parameter	WP+ Planck+ BICEP 2
SP $+\sum m_\nu + r_{0.05}$	h	0.645 ± 0.014
SP $+dn_s/d\ln k + \sum m_\nu + r_{0.05}$	$dn_s/d\ln k$	-0.0246±0.0091
SP $+N_{\rm eff} + \sum m_\nu + r_{0.05}$	$N_{\rm eff}$	3.7530 ± 0.26
SP $+ A_L + dn_s/d\ln k = 0 + \sum m_\nu + r_{0.05}$	A_L	1.19 ± 0.09
SP $+ A_L + dn_s/d\ln k \neq 0 + \sum m_\nu + r_{0.05}$	A_L	1.28 ± 0.09

Acknowledgments

We have used the HPC facility at IUCAA for the required computation. S. D. and S. M. acknowledge Council for Science and Industrial Research (CSIR), India, for the financial support as Senior Research Fellows.

References

[1] P. A. R. Ade et al., Planck 2013 results. XV. CMB power spectra and likelihood, preprint arXiv:1303.5075v2, (2013).

[2] P. A. R. Ade et al., Planck 2013 results. XVI. Cosmological parameters, preprint arXiv:1303.5076v2, (2013).

[3] P. A. R. Ade et al., BICEP 2 I: Detection Of B-mode Polarization at Degree Angular Scales, preprint arXiv:1403.3985, (2014).

[4] F. Beutler et al. The clustering of galaxies in the SDSS-III Baryon Oscillation Spectroscopic Survey: Signs of neutrino mass in current cosmological datasets, preprint arXiv:1403.4599, (2014)

[5] M. Archidiacono, N. Fornengo, S. Gariazzo, C. Giunti, S. Hannestad, et al. Light sterile neutrinos after BICEP 2, arXiv:1404.1794v2, (2014).

[6] J.-F. Zhang, Y.-H. Li and X. Zhang, Cosmological constraints on neutrinos after BICEP 2, arXiv:1404.3598v1, (2014).

[7] J.-F. Zhang, Y.-H. Li and X. Zhang, Sterile neutrinos help reconcile the observational results of primordial gravitational waves from Planck and BICEP 2, arXiv:1403.7028v2, (2014).

[8] C. Cheng and Q.-G. Huang, The Tilt of Primordial Gravitational Waves Spectra from BICEP 2, arXiv:1403.5463v1, (2014).

[9] C. Cheng and Q.-G. Huang, Constraints on the cosmological parameters from BICEP 2, Planck and WMAP, arXiv:1403.7173, (2014).

[10] C. Cheng, Q.-G. Huang and W. Zhao, Constraints on the extensions to the base ΛCDM model from BICEP 2, Planck and WMAP, arXiv:1404.3467v1, (2014).

[11] J. Q. Xia, Y. F. Cai, H. Li, X. Zhang, Evidence for bouncing evolution before inflation after BICEP 2, preprint arXiv:1403.7623, (2014).

[12] F. Wu, Y. Li, Y. Lu and X. Chen, Cosmological parameter fittings with the BICEP 2 data, preprint arXiv:1403.6462v1, (2014).

[13] J. Martin, C. Ringeval, R. Trotta, V. Vennin, Compatibility of Planck and BICEP 2 in the Light of Inflation, preprint arXiv:1405.7272, (2014).

[14] S. Das and T. Souradeep, SCoPE: An efficient method of Cosmological Parameter Estimation, preprint arXiv:1403.1271, (2014).

[15] A. Lewis and A. Challinor, CAMB code, `http://camb.info` .

[16] `"http://lambda.gsfc.nasa.gov/product/map/dr5/likelihood_get.cfm"`.

[17] `"http://wiki.cosmos.esa.int/planckpla/index.php/Main_Page"`.

[18] `http://bicepkeck.org/`

[19] A.G. Riess, L. Macri, S. Casertano, H. Lampeitl, H.C. Ferguson, et al. A 3 % Solution: Determination of the Hubble Constant with the Hubble Space Telescope and Wide Field Camera 3, Astrophys.J., 730, 119 (2011)

[20] A. Kosowsky and M. S. Turner, CBR anisotropy and the running of the scalar spectral index, Phys. Rev. D 52, R1739(R), (1995).

[21] M. Gerbino, A.Marchini, L. Pagano, L. Salvati, E. Di Valentino, and A. Melchiorri, Blue Gravity Waves from BICEP 2 ?, arXiv:1403.5732v1, (2014).

[22] K. M. Smith, C. Dvorkin, L. Boyle, N. Turok, M. Halpern, G. Hinshaw and B. Gold, On quantifying and resolving the BICEP 2/Planck tension over gravitational waves, arXiv:1404.0373v1 (2014).